Application No.: 10/715,481

Reply To Restriction Requirement March 28, 2006

Office Action dated February 28, 2006

Docket No.: 0505-1257P Art Unit: 3616

Page 2 of 4

## REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-20 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his restriction requirement in view of the remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

The Examiner has set forth a restriction requirement with regard to claims 1-20. The grouping of the claims is set forth as follows:

GROUP	CLAIMS	CLASSIFICATION
I	1-18	Class 180, Subclass 337
II	19 and 20	Class 74, Subclass 606R

Applicants have elected claims 1-18 for initial examination. However, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is improper in view of the fact that no serious burden is presented to the Examiner to consider all of the claims in a single application.

As set forth in Section 803 of the MPEP, the Examiner must examine an application on the merits if the examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden. Two criteria are identified for a proper requirement for restriction:

- 1. The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- 2. There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not required.

Applicants respectfully submit that a serious burden has not been placed on the Examiner to consider all of the claims in a single application. A review of the subject matter set

Application No.: 10/715,481

Reply To Restriction Requirement March 28, 2006

Office Action dated February 28, 2006

Docket No.: 0505-1257P

Art Unit: 3616

Page 3 of 4

forth in claims 1-18 would include a review of class 180, subclass 337 and class 74, subclass

606R. Thus, a different field of search really does not exist with regard to the claims of the

present application.

In order to be responsive to the Examiner's restriction requirement, claims 1-18 have

been initially elected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his restriction

requirement and act on all of the claims in the present application. If the Examiner does persist

in his restriction requirement, the right to file a divisional application directed to the non-elected

claims at a later date, if desired, is reserved.

**CLAIM FOR PRIORITY** 

The Examiner has not recognized the Applicants' claim for foreign priority. In view

of the fact that the Applicants' claim for foreign priority has been perfected, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority in his next

office action.

DRAWINGS

The Examiner has not approved the Formal Drawings submitted by the Applicants. It

is respectfully submitted that the drawings comply with the requirements of the USPTO. If

the Examiner has any objections to the Formal Drawings he is respectfully requested to

contact the undersigned as soon as possible so that appropriate action may be taken. No

further action is believed to be necessary at this time unless the undersigned receives a notice

from the Examiner.

Application No.: 10/715,481

JMS/mmi

Reply To Restriction Requirement March 28, 2006

Office Action dated February 28, 2006

Docket No.: 0505-1257P

Art Unit: 3616

Page 4 of 4

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 3, 2004 and September 7, 2004. Initialed copies of the PTO-1449 should be sent to the undersigned at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

Favorable action on the present application is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

James M. Slattery

Reg. No. 28,380

(703) 205-8000 P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747